

EGBERT S. KING,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner)	
of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

I. STANDARD OF REVIEW

“By contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting FED. R. CIV. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Where a

party fails to object to the Magistrate Judge's M&R, the district court may accept, reject, or modify the M&R without explanation. Camby, 718 F.2d at 199.

II. ANALYSIS

The Magistrate Judge issued his M&R on May 24, 2011. (Doc. No. 13). Plaintiff has not filed any objection to the Magistrate Judge's thorough examination and denial of Plaintiff's claims. This Court finds no clear error with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Thus, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge's M&R, **GRANTS** Defendant's motion for summary judgment, (Doc. No. 11), and **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, (Doc. No. 9).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that:

1. The Magistrate Judge's M&R, (Doc. No. 13), is **ADOPTED**;
2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment, (Doc. No. 11), is **GRANTED**; and
3. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, (Doc. No. 9), is **DENIED**.

Signed: December 5, 2011



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge

